DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 695 SO 004 802

AUTHOR	Gow, Steele; Salmon-Cox, Leslie
TITLE	University-Urban Interface Program. A University and Its Community Confront Problems and Goals.
INSTITUTION	Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. University Urban Interface Program.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0725
PUB DATE	Jun 72
GRANT	OEG-2-9-480725-1027
NOTE	78p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	City Government; City Problems; Community Health Services; *Community Study; *Conflict Resolution; Higher Education; *School Community Relationship; Social Action; *Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS	Pittsburgh

ABSTRACT

This is a report on a series of University-Community Forums in the Goals Project of the University-Urban Interface Program of the University of Pittsburgh in which the relationships of urban universities and their urban communities are explored. A review of the original study plan and an explanation of departures from this plan precedes a discussion of an opinion survey on community goals and four forums conducted during the project. Topics chosen for the forums were: 1) Conflict Utilization; 2) Administration of Justice; 3) The Domain of Health; and 4) Goals and Government of the Metropolis. Four common guidelines for improving university and community interaction which emerged from the forums are defined together with a related area in which community and university participants remained in disagreements. Related documents are represented by ED 063 897 through ED 063 903, ED 066 398, ED 065 426, ED 065 427, HE 003 261, and SO 004 803 through SO 004 806. (SHM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BHE

ED 070695

A UNIVERSITY AND ITS COMMUNITY CONFRONT PROBLEMS AND GOALS

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: SO HE
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

UNIVERSITY-URBAN INTERFACE PROGRAM

CONTRACT NO. OEG-2-9-480725-1027
PROJECT NO. 80725

SUBMITTED TO THE
BUREAU OF RESEARCH U.S.O.E.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
JUNE, 1972

SO 004 802

ED 070695

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A UNIVERSITY AND ITS COMMUNITY

CONFRONT PROBLEMS AND GOALS

A report on a series of University-Community Forums in the Goals Project of the University-Urban Interface Program of the University of Pittsburgh

By Steele Gow and

Leslie Salmon-Cox

Contents

		Page
PREFACE		i
I.	PLANS AND PURPOSES	1
II.	PITTSBURGH GOALS STUDY	8
III.	CONFLICT UTILIZATION	21
IV.	ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE	32
V.	THE DOMAIN OF HEALTH	46
VI.	GOALS AND GOVERNMENT OF THE METROPOLIS	58
VII.	GUIDELINES GLEANED FROM THE FORUM SERIES	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY		75

June, 1972

PREFACE

The Community Goals Project which is reported here is part of a University-Urban Interface Program (UUIP) which the University of Pittsburgh is conducting with U.S. Office of Education grant support. Special thanks are due the Buhl Foundation which has supported background research on University-Community Relations that facilitates publication of this particular report.

In other component projects, the UUIP is monitoring and evaluating University-sponsored activities with urban minority groups, the impact of University physical expansion on community relations, and a variety of University efforts to communicate with its several "publics." In addition, the UUIP is intended to develop recommendations for improving the University's own internal organization for relating to the urban community in which it is located. The comprehending purpose of the UUIP's several parts is to learn from this University's experience--including its failures as well as its successes--how urban universities generally can improve their interaction with their communities. The University of Pittsburgh is subjecting itself to this sort of institutional self-study because of a conviction that universities and their communities will prosper or not together.

The Goals Project reported here is to be viewed in that context.

Albert C. Van Dusen
Secretary of the University and
Principal Investigator - UUIP

I. PLANS AND PURPOSES

The citizenry's expectations of a major urban university have been changing. Traditionally the university has been expected to provide liberal and professional education and to conduct research and scholarly inquiry. Increasingly, though, the citizens have come to expect that the university also will pitch in to solve the problems of the problem-beset urban complex where it is located. The urban university is inclined to agree that this is a legitimate expectation and one that it ought to be able to meet as part of its service role. Yet neither the urban community nor the urban university is at all satisfied with their working relationship and the tension between them is if anything increasing. Why? And what is to be done?

This Community Long-Range Goals Project was addressed to those questions. When it began about two years ago, we thought we at least understood the nature of the problem and even that we had a fair idea of a solution. Now we see the problem somewhat differently and we are a lot less sanguine about solving it. However, we think we--both we of the university and we of the community--have learned some things that are worth passing on.

This report on the Project, therefore, will be as straight-forward and candid an account as we can make of what we set out to do, how and why we changed our plans as we went along, and what has been distilled from the experience. This first chapter will review the original plan and explain the departures from it. The following five chapters will report on an opinion survey and four forums we conducted. And the final chapter will attempt to tell what we got out of the whole venture.

In the original proposal, the Project was introduced this way:

An urban university, even if well motivated to interact constructively with its community, ordinarily is handicapped by inadequate knowledge of the community's long-range goals. The source of the difficulty, of course, is the fact that an urban community seldom speaks with one voice--particularly when the community encompasses a complex metropolitan region, with parts of several states, a multitude of local government jurisdictions, and a myriad of organizations and interest groups. This certainly is the situation confronted by the University of Pittsburgh, as it is by most urban universities in this country.

This Project of our Program, therefore, aims to develop the means for getting regular and reliable readings of the urban community's goals and for continuously mediating between emerging goals and the policy-making processes of universities and other key institutions of the community. In undertaking to do this, the University of Pittsburgh not only expects to serve its own institutional purpose and to benefit its own community, but also intends to develop a model which may be valuable for other urban universities and their communities.

Our plans culminate in (1) establishment of the practice of convening every two or three years of a Community Goals Assembly* through which newly emerging goals are identified, formulated and brought into reasonable priority ordering with already recognized long-range goals, and (2) establishment of an organization we are tentatively calling the Community Policy Research Institute which feeds information into the Assemblies and translates the Assemblies' deliberations into operationally useful policy recommendations.

The Community Goals Assemblies, as we envision them, will have to be able to elicit and articulate the aims and aspirations of those elements of the community that ordinarily are ignored or not heard in high councils of key institutions, as well as giving expression to the vocal and easily recognized elements. They will have to be capable of reflecting the thinking of young people and of ordinarily repressed minorities as well as that of persons who have achieved prominence. And they will have to combine an openness that invites the unexpected with a degree of preparation and organization which assures productive discussion instead of vaporous maundering.

---

*What are called here Assemblies later were redesignated Forums when the idea of one large multi-topic gathering was replaced with the idea of a set of several single-topic gatherings scheduled over several months.

We organized first a small steering committee of University of Pittsburgh faculty members, drawing principally from the social sciences and social professions. This steering committee was to mobilize a more broadly representative advisory committee and, with it, was to plan the Assembly, prepare the roster of community participants to be invited, and commission the preparation of five background papers for the Assembly.

Early in its deliberations, however, the steering committee decided that one large Assembly would be too unwieldy to permit real participation by those attending and that multiple topics in a single Assembly would prevent in-depth consideration. Consequently, the plan was changed to that of a set or series of gatherings, redesignated Forums, each with its topic and roster of participants chosen for expertise or interest in that topic.

Also, the steering committee decided to add to its own roster those persons who would be chosen to be principal authors of the five background papers. Each of these authors would form his own advisory committee on his topic, to review his paper, and to help prepare the broadly representative roster of persons to be invited to participate in that Forum of the series.

A further change made by the steering committee was to have not only the members of advisory committees but also members of the steering committee itself serve on a volunteer basis, except for those chosen to be authors of background papers. Actually only four of the papers required compensation, because the fifth was prepared by the Project's director. It also was decided by the steering committee that one of the papers should be based on an opinion survey among

community "influentials" about the importance, desirability and likelihood of action on a wide range of issues. Relevant aspects of this report would be used in each Forum along with the background paper on its particular topic. Thus there were to be four, rather than five, Forums but each was to have a general survey paper and a specific topic paper. It was hoped that this would preserve some of the coherence that going from one multi-topic Assembly to several single-topic Forums might otherwise sacrifice.

The steering committee, meeting over several months, considered a large number of topics, seeking ones which would give a range suggestive of the scope that the projected Community Policy Research Institutes might have and which would be provocative of dialogue between general community participants and specialists in each field. Eventually the choices were narrowed to those topics appearing in the titles of Chapters III, IV, V and VI. The author or team of authors for each of the specific-topic background papers were selected, and Professor Jiri Nehnevajsa was commissioned to prepare and, with Alan Coleman, to conduct and analyze the opinion survey which is reported in Chapter II.

Advisory committees were set up for each of the specific-topic background papers and early drafts of the papers submitted to them for review and suggested revision. These committees and authors were directed to seek presentations that would provoke discussion. Simultaneously they were directed to submit suggestions as to persons to be invited to participate in the Forums, trying to get a broad and representative cross-section of the interested elements of the community. A special effort was made for all Forums to get

representation from minority groups, from women, from young as well as older and more established persons, from lay groups as well as professional ones, and from various sections of the metropolitan Pittsburgh area. The rosters of advisory committee members and Forum participants appearing after each of the four Forum chapters reflect this effort. The steering committee roster appears at the end of Chapter II.

The staff work in recruiting participants for the Forums and all the administrative back-up for them was provided by Mrs. Leslie Salmon-Cox, research assistant to the Project's director. She also managed the Forums themselves and has prepared the reports on them which appear herein.

The general format for all of the Forums was similar. A plenary session opened the proceedings, usually with brief welcoming remarks and orientation by the Chancellor and other University officials, followed by a presentation of relevant findings from Professor Nehnevajsa's survey and an oral summary or introduction of the specific-topic background paper. Both the survey and background papers were distributed to participants in advance but brief discussions of them at the opening plenary session were intended to remind participants that the purpose of the Forums was to elicit their views and ideas rather than to make presentations to them as an audience. Each Forum then broke out into three or four discussion groups, each group with an assigned discussion leader and a reporter chosen by and from among its members. The group discussions proceeded through the morning, broke for lunch, and resumed for most of the afternoon. A feed-back plenary session was held late in the afternoon and, after refreshments and

dinner, the day's discussions were reviewed again for one to two hours to elicit those second thoughts and reactions that had been missed earlier.

The Forums were held at approximately one month intervals, beginning in October, 1971, and in the order in which they appear in this report. All were held at a hotel near the University of Pittsburgh campus.

While the conclusions to be drawn from this experience are reserved for consideration in the last chapter, several things can be said at this point about the whole Project. First, we were reasonably successful in getting the vocal participation not only of those easily identified persons who regularly participate in civic discussions but also that of other less visible and usually less articulate elements of the community. Blacks were represented at least proportionately in all committees and invitation lists. Women were well represented; young people were less so. Faculty of this and other universities were held down in numbers, with some effort, in order to assure that professionals from the field and lay citizens would predominate. And quite divergent and conflicting viewpoints were evident in all of the Forums, as intended.

The discussions were sometimes quite heated and the host University came in for a good deal of sharp criticism, at least as much as other community institutions. On several occasions the good faith and intentions of the Project itself were questioned and at least once the University of Pittsburgh's leadership evidenced uneasiness about the whole venture. However, conflicting perceptions of the University by

the community and of the community by the University were at least brought out and openly discussed, and no blood was shed in the process.

Finally, it needs to be pointed out as the following chapters are read, that a purpose of the Project was to produce insights and ideas useful to a wide variety of community institutions and organizations, not only to the host University. While hopefully the University has been helped to acquire a more realistic idea of what various elements of the community want and expect of it, other community institutions and organizations also should have found in the discussions some ideas as to what they expect of each other in relation to the pursuit of community goals. As Professor Nehnevajsa's survey in the next chapter suggests, there is concern enough for the community's future to be shared by all.

II. PITTSBURGH GOALS STUDY

By Jiri Nehnevajsa in collaboration with Alan N. Coleman

Introduction

In the Spring of 1971, 106 prominent Pittsburgh community leaders responding to a mailed questionnaire, expressed their views on twenty-eight civic changes which might occur in the community over the next five years, that is, up through 1975 approximately.

For each of the twenty-eight potential changes, they were asked to assess its likelihood, desirability and relative importance. Moreover, additional options could be specified by the leaders themselves in the event they felt the twenty-eight were unduly restrictive of community concern. Each leader was also asked to select three issues considered particularly central to the community's future. For each of the three, they were asked to indicate (a) what ought to be done; (b) what measures, if any, should be avoided; (c) what, in their opinion, would actually happen over the coming five-year period; (d) what organizations or groups might share their views regarding a preferred course of action; (e) what organizations or groups might recommend different, or opposing, courses of action; and (f) what measures the universities of the city could or should undertake regarding the issue. A final question called for an estimation of the basic trends characterizing Pittsburgh development for the five-year time span.

The leaders included representatives from (a) Government and the Law; (b) Business and Banking; (c) Organized Labor; (d) Education; (e) Health and Welfare; (f) Housing and Urban Development; (g) Black Community Programs; (h) Anti-Poverty Programs; (i) Religious Social Service Programs; (j) Environmental Control Programs; (k) the Mass Media; and (l) Others.*

*Throughout, the term "all leaders" will refer to the whole aggregate of participants in the study, disregarding the different groups mentioned here. The term "groups of leaders" will, on the other hand, be used for results considered in terms of the participant's main group location in the community (that is, groups (a) through (l) above).

OBJECTIVES

The main purpose of the study was to determine the extent to which there exists community consensus regarding a variety of major changes in Pittsburgh and, of course, the extent to which widely differing perspectives of community leaders might contribute to conflict, or at least significant difficulties, on these issues.

In turn, the identification of the perspectives among the community's leaders might serve to open up a systematic dialogue concerning the city's agenda and priorities for the immediate future. This has been the more pragmatic aspiration of the study without assuming that such a dialogue would not be taking place already, or that it would not take place without this (or a similar) study, or that it would not happen through other, non-research related, mechanisms.

The results, presented here in summary form, hopefully will provide some elementary feedback to the leaders themselves as to how other leaders of the community look at Pittsburgh's near future. Also they can, in capsule form, examine the extent to which their particular views are shared or at variance with the sentiments of these other leaders.

LIMITATIONS

The twenty-eight Pittsburgh futures are stated, quite deliberately, in rather general terms. Thus, for example, we are concerned with the "Rapid Transit System" issue without regard for the particular configuration, technical design problems, legal, political and social ramifications, or the costs of construction and maintenance once implemented. Should it prove fruitful, subsequent phases of this study can proceed with examining

the pros and cons of concrete proposals by which desired changes can come about or unwanted changes prevented.

We certainly do not suggest that the selected leaders are the only individuals whose views might be of strategic importance for the future of Pittsburgh. Others could have been included. However, in this initial phase, the choices were deliberately limited and whatever else may be said about their selection, they are, by any measure, among the community's major decision makers.

We do not assume that the views of the leaders are representative of the organizations and groups they are associated with; nor do we assume that their opinions are at odds with these groups. Hence, we do not wish to imply that, for example, the Government leaders who chose to cooperate in this study somehow made official or semi-official statements regarding the Government's position on the issue at hand. And so on.

Finally, we do not assume that it is the community's leadership alone whose views are decisive and that the wider public and its perspectives are unimportant, or even less important. Rather, at the outset, we wished to limit our inquiry in this manner and to subsequently expand the research-and-action dialogue to other segments of the community if this were to prove warranted.

MAJOR RESULTS*

1. There is ample evidence of an intense interest in, and a deep concern for, the future of Pittsburgh among the city's leaders. This indeed must be construed as signifying the kind of climate in which meaningful dialogue and meaningful action in the direction of desirable changes are not only possible on a relatively sustained basis, but welcome also.

2. There is a great deal of consensus among all the groups of leaders as to the desirability, likelihood and importance of various changes. Thus there exists basic agreement on broad purposes and the leaders are fundamentally not at odds with each other regarding community goals, nor are they in disagreement as to the nature of the wanted thrusts for the coming years.

3. Leaders in Government and Law appear to occupy a key position in the pattern of consensus in that their perspectives (desirability, likelihood and importance assessments) are generally closer to the views of <u>all</u> the other groups of leaders than are the sentiments of any other single group. This seems rather fortunate because it suggests that Pittsburgh Government leaders are in a position to be both agents for change and catalysts for divergent views, without unacceptable risks of community conflict.

---

* A total of 234 community leaders were asked to participate in the survey. The 110 who chose to respond represent about 47 percent of the total. This must be considered a rather high response rate since the instrument required about an hour of the individual's time and, by definition, these are among the busiest people in the community. The analysis is based on 106 responses with the remaining ones arriving after the basic tabulations had been completed.

4. The data support the interpretation that the leaders are modestly optimistic regarding the future of Pittsburgh. In this pattern, Black Community Program leaders and leaders in Business and Banking, for somewhat different reasons, appear to be the least optimistic of all the groups.

5. Many leaders, in all groups, do not expect much in the way of positive change over the five year interval, and quite a few are concerned with the prospects of decline -- mainly occasioned by the continued population drift into suburbia (and elsewhere) coupled with the persistence of the complex systems of governance in Allegheny County. Such concern results also from problems associated with the steel industry and the absence of an expectation that new businesses and industries will be attracted into Pittsburgh and provide the needed diversification of the economy.

6. There is an overwhelming consensus with reference to the first ten items, or issues, listed in the Appendix. More than 90 percent of all the leaders agree on the desirability of change in the following areas:

1. Waste disposal and air and water pollution control devices.
2. Reorganization of public welfare agencies and programs.
3. Approaches regarding the use of drugs.
4. Development of a rapid transit system.
5. Distribution and accessibility of health care services.
6. The administration of criminal justice.
7. Development of new businesses and industries.
8. Pollution control laws.
9. The economic development of the Black community.
10. Low and middle income housing, including housing for the aged.

This means, we suggest, the following:

(a) These issues require no further discussions or justifications as to concern with major goals, only as to techniques or policy;

(b) Disagreements over means toward their attainment are likely to be fairly low-keyed;

(c) The room for the formulation and adoption of policies for these issues is quite considerable without the danger of generating community conflict provided the measures can be shown feasible (in terms of human and physical resources, including fiscal ones) and promising to bring about the postulated improvements.

7. The next eleven items listed in the Appendix (ranked 11 through 20.5) are seen as areas of desired change by more than two-thirds of the leaders -- though fewer than 90 percent:

1. The regulation of automobile traffic.
2. Payment for health care services.
3. Public school programs and curricula.
4. Revenue sources for the city government.
5. Metropolitan government for the county.
6. The conditions of labor union pacts and agreements.
7. Programs of racial integration in the city.
8. The tax climate as it pertains to business and economic development.
9. Private organizations and welfare programs.
10. Political power development in the Black community.
11. Television, radio and newspaper coverage of Pittsburgh events.

Despite the prevailing consensus, the patterning of the responses which fall outside the general agreement (respondents who view particular issues as less than desirable rather than, as more than two-thirds do, desirable) is indicative of potential cleavages. The major ones to highlight are the following:

(a) Anti-poverty leaders are split among themselves as to the desirability of Metropolitan Government, changes in the tax climate, the need for changes in union pacts and agreements, the need for changes regarding private organizations in relation to welfare programs, and changes in the development of political power in the Black community.

(b) Black community leaders are divided as to the desirability of efforts at racial integration. They are also split over the tax climate issue.

(c) Government and Law leaders are divided, in particular, over the need for changes in public school programs and curricula and over the tax climate issue. Metropolitan government is also questioned by a few of them.

This would suggest the need for a careful, balanced dialogue on issues such as these since in so far as there is reluctance, or even opposition, its patterning tends to enhance what otherwise would be only a minor cleavage (if the non-dominant responses were about evenly scattered among the groups of leaders).

A plausible interpretation of the most salient points is as follows:

Steps in the direction of changes as they pertain to issues mentioned regarding the Anti-Poverty leaders need to be carefully evaluated in their probable effect on Pittsburgh's patterns of poverty and in their impact on programs designed to combat poverty, lest such efforts stimulate division among those leaders or pit that leadership against other significant segments of the community.

Major strides in the direction of racial integration call for the initiative of the Black community and its leaders and spokesmen, since programs offered by others (non-Blacks) stand to divide the Black community or pit its leadership against other community elements. More specifically, this means that the coming type and pace of efforts at racial integration has to be determined chiefly by Black citizens themselves provided the wider community climate remains as receptive as this study shows it to be, or becomes even more receptive.

Proposals to alter, presumably beneficially, the tax climate as it affects the business community above all (a matter on which Business and Banking leaders are unanimous, and many consider essential for attracting new business development to Pittsburgh) are likely to be very divisive within the community (even though predominant feeling is favorable) unless they are tied functionally to other badly needed efforts, and unless they are so formulated as not to be construed as favoring a particular segment (business) of the community. Such proposals must thus be seen as instrumental to other desired changes.

Educators are unanimous (with the exception of one respondent who chose not to evaluate "desirability" one way or another) on the desirability of reforms in public school programs and curricula, and by far most of the leaders in all the groups agree on this. However the issue is somewhat controversial among Government and Business leaders. This suggests that well thought-out stepwise programs, rather than those of an immediate overhaul variety, would stand a better chance of producing desirable results.

Overall, as a precondition for policy deliberations and planning, it would seem essential to discover the reasons for which some of the leaders express reluctance and opposition to changes which by far most of the others consider desirable (and important). This is particularly so with regard to those issues on which what we have termed a "patterning" of dissensus exists.

8. An analysis of the reasons for reluctance -- and the resulting division of opinion -- is particularly needed in conjunction with these issues (ranked 22-24 in the Appendix):

1. East Liberty-type development programs.
2. The impact of the Interstate Highway System.
3. Reorganization of the Board of Education.

A majority of the leaders finds change in these areas desirable but the level of agreement fails to reach the two-thirds margin. Without a clarification of the objectives and the rationale underlying them, as well as an assessment of the probable effects of moving in these directions, the formulation of actual proposals -- not to speak of their adoption -- would seem premature at this time. A fair magnitude of intracommunity conflict would have to be anticipated as the cost associated with such changes.

9. With regard to the remaining four issues (ranked 25-28 in the Appendix), each was found to be acceptable by fewer than 50 percent of the leaders:

1. Changes in long term investment patterns in the community.
2. Changes in the direction of labor union organizing.
3. Development of political power among public welfare recipients.
4. Introduction of a "voucher" program for selecting among public and private schools.

We suggest these are alternatives not to be pursued at this time.

10. All in all, the data point to a very high receptivity to change among these Pittsburgh leaders. This means that there is very little, if any, "inertia" built into the community's situation and the business at hand is primarily that of identifying viable ways of getting things done, rather than having to convince major portions of the community about the need for significant changes.

APPENDIX:

DESIRABILITY, IMPORTANCE AND LIKELIHOOD OF TWENTY-EIGHT PITTSBURGH FUTURES: ALL LEADERS

Issue: as worded in questionnaire	Desirability		Importance		Likelihood		Per cent Acceptance
	Average	Rank	Average	Rank	Average	Rank	
Innovations in waste disposal and air and water pollution control devices	+1.62	1	8.39	1	7.81	2	96.2
Reorganization of public welfare agencies and programs	+1.60	2	8.27	4	6.92	3	96.2
Introduction of new approaches regarding the use of drugs	+1.58	3	8.38	2	6.61	8	96.2
Development of a Rapid Transit System for Pittsburgh and surrounding communities	+1.54	4	8.28	3	6.00	11	93.4
Innovations in the distribution and accessibility of health care services	+1.51	5	8.24	5	6.70	7	98.1
Major changes in the administration of criminal justice	+1.47	6	8.05	9	5.84	13	97.2
The growth of new businesses and industries in the community	+1.45	7	8.09	6	4.67	22	93.4
Development of new laws governing air and water pollution control	+1.40	8	8.08	7	7.78	2	93.4
Innovations in the economic development of the Black Community	+1.38	9	7.88	10	6.01	9.5	95.3

New developments in low and middle income housing, including housing for the aged	+1.35	10	8.07	8	6.89	4	96.2	
Major changes in the regulation of automobile traffic	+1.29	11	7.29	15	4.99	19	89.6	
New developments regarding the payment for health care services	+1.28	12	7.66	13	6.88	5	87.7	
Major Changes in public school programs and curricula	+1.27	13	7.77	11	6.01	9.5	86.8	
Development of new sources of revenue for the city government	+1.21	14	7.71	12	5.89	12	85.8	
Metropolitan Government for Allegheny County	+1.19	15	7.14	16	2.54	28	82.1	
Development of new programs for racial integration in the city	+1.07	16	7.51	14	5.46	15	83.0	
Innovations in the conditions of union pacts and agreements	+1.02	17	6.94	19	4.43	24	74.5	
Major changes in the tax climate as it pertains to business and economic development	+1.01	18	7.09	17	5.36	16	76.4	
Innovations by private organizations regarding welfare programs	+1.00	19	6.71	20	5.25	18	73.6	
Major changes in the development of political power in the Black community	+0.95	20.5	6.99	18	5.60	14	73.6	
Innovations in television, radio and newspaper coverage of Pittsburgh events	+0.95	20.5	5.52	27	4.48	23	76.4	

Reorganization of the Pittsburgh Board of Education	+0.75	22	5.88	24	4.40	25	60.4
Construction of new urban development projects similar to East Liberty	+0.60	23	6.57	21	5.37	17	61.3
Changes in the direction of community development resulting from the completion of the Interstate Highway System in and around Pittsburgh	+0.53	24	6.18	23	6.79	6	56.6
Alteration in the patterns of long-term investment in the community	+0.48	25	6.26	22	4.33	26	46.2
Major changes in the direction of labor union organizing in the metropolitan area	+0.34	26	5.59	25	4.97	20	44.3
Development of political power among public welfare recipients	-0.04	27	5.55	26	4.93	21	34.0
Introduction of a "voucher" program to allow parents and children to select among private and public schools	-0.21	28	4.32	28	2.57	27	26.4

Explanations:

1. Table ordered in terms of desirability from most wanted to (relatively) least wanted change.
2. Desirability scale goes from (-2.00) to (+2.00).
3. Importance scale goes from (0) to (10).
4. Likelihood scale goes from (0) to (10).
5. Per cent acceptability gives the percentages of all Prominents who considered a particular item "desirable" or "very desirable".
6. When the same index value results (e.g. on desirability, likelihood or importance), the rank assigned is, as is conventional, the average rank for such tied values. For instance, rank 9.5 appears twice, and represents ranks 9 and 10 for which the items in question are tied (in this example, on "likelihood").

ADVISORY GROUP - GOALS SURVEY

The Pittsburgh Goals Study, summarized in these pages, is the result of a variety of efforts contributed by colleagues here at the University of Pittsburgh. Although they cannot, individually or collectively, be held accountable for the evaluations of the data in this report, their advice, expertise, guidance, interest and support made the study possible. It is indeed a privilege to have had the benefit of their counsel:

Mrs. Leslie Salmon-Cox, Research Assistant to Dr. Gow, Division of Instructional Experimentation.

Mr. Phillip Sidel, Executive Director, Social Science Information Center.

And the following, who also constitute the Steering Committee of the entire project:

Dr. Albert C. Van Dusen, Secretary of the University, Principal Investigator, University-Urban Interface Program.

Dr. Steele Gow, Chairman, Dean, School of General Studies and the Division of Instructional Experimentation.

Dr. Robert Brictson, Director, Research Programs, Office of the Secretary.

Dr. Holbert Carroll, Professor, Department of Political Science.

Mr. Morton Coleman, Professor, School of Social Work.

Dr. Joseph Eaton, Professor, Graduate School of Public Health, and Social Work.

Mr. David Epperson, Dean, School of Social Work.

Dr. Herschel Griffin, Dean, Graduate School of Public Health.

Dr. Matthew Holden, Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin.

Dr. Burkart Holzner, Chairman, Department of Sociology.

Dr. Edgar Hoover, Professor, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs.

Dr. Saul Katz, Professor, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs.

Mrs. Caryl Kline, Director, Continuing Education for Women.

Dr. Waldo Treuting, Professor, Graduate School of Public Health.

J.N. & A.C.

III. CONFLICT UTILIZATION

Introduction

The first Community Goals Forum was held on October 21, 1971. The background paper focused on the subject, "Conflict Utilization," and was prepared by an interdisciplinary group of authors. The major author, Morton Coleman, has his formal educational roots in Social Work and Political Science, but has also a long career of community-civic involvement and was, at the time of paper's writing, the Acting Dean of the School of Social Work. Other authors included a second professor from Social Work, also having extensive community work background, two graduate students, one from Social Work, another from the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, and a Carnegie-Mellon professor, from that University's School of Urban and Public Affairs. The entire paper was edited by Pitt's Director of University News and Publications.

The diversity of background of the authors was reflected in the concerns tackled by the paper. Theoretical, definitional problems were juxtaposed with real-life examples, and practical suggestions. The process of group-write proved frustrating to the authors and, though the paper went through three extensive revisions and ample editing, a certain lack of coherence was still evident in the final draft, which then was addressed to an exceedingly mixed audience that ran from women on welfare to hospital administrators, with politicians, media representatives, and a mix of University people in addition.

The multi-faceted nature of the paper, the diversity of the audience, the organizational complications inherent in the fact that

this was the first Forum, all made for a mixed set of responses and reactions throughout the day.

The Paper

The background paper began with a discussion of the nature of organizations. The authors stressed the natural and inherent place of conflict within any organization, emphasizing that recognition of conflict was the first step to proper utilization. In the authors' own words,

> An organization is an open, relatively permanent, relatively complex, discernible system of incompatible and compatible interactions that operate in a domain.*

(Needless to say, a definition so worded presented difficulties on at least two fronts: among people familiar with organizational research, the finer points of the definition might be open to argument; among people unfamiliar with such research, and with "academic" language generally, the definition served as a communication block rather than aid).

A second section of the paper continued in much the same vein to look at the writings and thought on the subject of conflict. The authors again offered their own definition,

> Conflict is stress and strain. It is neither unusual, atypical nor dysfunctional. Its potential is to be viewed as ever-present. In the abstract it is neutral, but valued in an interactional context.**

It was this theme--of the value and usefulness of conflict--which ran through the entire paper and was a major point of emphasis. A third section of the paper pinpointed various "arenas of conflict," that is,

*Coleman, et.al., p.5.
**Ibid., p.9.

several key processes within organizations. As these processes are unfolding--processes related to the survival of the organization, to the way rules are made within the organization, to the planning and implementation of organization programs--there are many opportunities for conflict to arise. At these points, the authors say, a good manager looks for conflict, and sees if it can be used to further rather than hinder the organization's goals.

A fourth section of the paper examined the Pittsburgh region and presented several anecdotal accounts of local conflict situations. The fifth section of the paper provided a rationale for the argument that it was the place of the University to undertake the education of managers in the utilization of conflict; and a final, sixth, section of the paper sketched a proposed curriculum model for such an education.

The Discussion

Within the three discussion groups, conversation ranged over the topics covered in the paper, and many more, in addition. Each of the discussion leaders for the small groups, at this conference, was one of the paper's authors. Each author-leader, and each participant through a letter sent in advance of the Forum, was aware that the paper could be seen to be organized around a series of questions, which themselves would form the basis of discussion. At the outset, then, participants might have formed their day's work around the notions:

> Is conflict overestimated? What is the relationship between the conflict process and modern urban organizations? Is the present system of management training producing the kinds of people we need? If the present system of management training is not producing the kinds of people we need, what kind of training process is necessary? Who should oversee this process? How should it be done?

Each of these questions, of course, entailed a series of more specific, concise questions. All participants, then, started with a similar basis: the background paper and an outline-like sketch of how discussion might be framed.

Notes on the various discussions of the small groups reveal that in each group there were both some similar concerns and some unique ones. The question of the nature of conflict in organizations was raised in several places. A frequently heard sentiment was that decision-making in large organizations was done in secret, at the "pre-organizational level" and that this process precluded honest conflict. Another group voiced the same sentiment when their discussion focused on the "making of deals," the fact that "the accommodation of various interests is frequently done in secret." That this was the case led, in part, to the conclusion that conflict utilization skills were not easily taught, or even understood. Such secret, deal-making ability, it was concluded, is impossible to teach. One participant, from a social welfare agency which depends on social psychological theory as a basis of operation, said, "I haven't had much success in training psychologists to be good administrators. Some people can be taught and others cannot."

A media representative pointed out that, in his opinion, those men who "made it to the top" were "generalists--people who can be catalysts in their own organizations and in others as well." Another participant, a government social agency representative, decried the fact that "we have made management the only way to a financially rewarding life...we have forced credentialed people to become managers," and he obviously felt that this often was a mistake.

In each of the groups the conversation fairly quickly came to focus on the nature, and possibility, of training programs. Though there was discussion of conflict--and its characteristics as participants were aware of the process in their own lives--it was this discussion which was unique, not generalizable. One participant noted, for example, that as far as he was concerned, "Conflict produces change...conflict is change." But most statements were not at this more abstract level, but were geared to specific examples. There was discussion around the examples used in the paper, as well as of examples drawn from the working lives of the participants. There seemed to be something near consensus on the notion that conflict was neither unusual nor difficult to recognize, but that finding ways to deal with it, let alone "utilize" it, was another matter.

Each of the groups finally came to the matter of considering what role the University might play in the training of managers, or in the "conflict utilization" area generally. The curriculum model suggested in the paper was refused outright by each of the groups; none of them felt that what was proposed was a worthwhile idea. Reasons for this ranged from feelings that any such training was impossible, to concern over duplication of existing efforts, to an insistence that it is not young students but on-the-job managers who require training. This last thought led to the proposal, stated by several, that the University, if it is going to consider any sort of new program in this area, would be best looking into the possibility of a continuing-education type of program for people already possessed of work experience. There was the caveat stated in one group that the University was in a poor position attempting to train managers to become more responsive to

conflict utilization and community needs unless it put its own house in order first. However, others in that group pointed to the possibility--already observable at some other large universities--that an urban university so motivated could change itself in the process of helping others to change.

Summary Discussion

In the late afternoon and early evening summary discussions, several points were made, in a variety of ways. First, there was the rejection of the curriculum model, as stated in the paper. However, secondly, there was agreement that the University might be doing something in this area. The exact content of the suggestions varied. Some said the University might try to play "broker" in various community disputes. Perhaps the most frequently mentioned notion was the one regarding a short-term continuing-education course for those already in management positions. There was also agreement with the paper authors' proposal that any management training must be inter-disciplinary in nature. However, there was sharp dissensus over just which skills can be taught, and which are either character traits or so inherent in a particular position that they can be learned only while filling that position. Almost all participants, both in the formal and informal feedback sessions, expressed satisfaction with the very act of coming together which took place in that day's conference.

Though at some points during the day there had been some suspicion voiced over the intent of the University in calling the conference, the give and take at the feedback sessions, and the authors' willingness to accept criticisms of their paper seemed to reassure participants that,

in fact, there was no hidden agenda, no attempt to gain community approval of some University scheme. This last point surfaced again, particularly at the second Forum, and became a focal point of discussion. However, at this first Forum it was only a scant suspicion, overcome by the end of the day.

Many expressed the desire to meet again, under similar auspices; expressed the feeling that there is a dearth of such community-University communication, and that a day devoted to such communication was a day well spent.

ADVISORY GROUP - CONFLICT UTILIZATION

Mr. Robert Bolden
Director, Model Cities
City of Pittsburgh
1500 Allegheny Building
429 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Mr. Donald Henderson
Associate Provost
University of Pittsburgh
133 Cathedral of Learning
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Dr. Lawrence Howard, Dean
Graduate School of Public and
International Affairs
University of Pittsburgh
704 Bruce Hall
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Mrs. Frankie Jeter
VISTA Office
Century Building
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Mr. Edward Noroian, Administrator
Presbyterian-University Hospital
230 Lothrop Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Mr. Robert Paternoster
Department of Planning
City of Pittsburgh
Public Safety Building, 7th Floor
First Avenue and Grant Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Mrs. Dorothy Richardson
CASH - Housing Court
Public Safety Building
First Avenue and Grant Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Mr. James Robinson, Principal
Schenley High School
Bigelow and Centre Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

FORUM I, CONFLICT UTILIZATION, October 21, 1971

Baum, Martha, University of Pittsburgh, University-Urban Interface Program

Beal, Frank S., Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare

Bingler, John H., Jr., Thorp, Reed and Armstrong

Bregman, Morton H., Vocational Rehabilitation Center

Brictson, Robert, University of Pittsburgh, Research Programs, Office of the Secretary

Bullock, John T., Jr., Pittsburgh Model Cities

Carter, Phillip, University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs

Colangelo, Joseph, University of Pittsburgh, News and Publications

Coleman, David A., University of Pittsburgh, University Times

Coleman, Morton, University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work

Cooper, William W., Carnegie-Mellon University, School of Urban and Public Affairs

Cunningham, James, University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work

Edmunds, Arthur J., Urban League

Epperson, David E., University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work

Feit, Marvin D., University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work

Flournoy, Nicholas, Neighborhood Centers Association

Freeman, Henry, Family and Children's Service

Froehlich, William B., Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission

Gabell, Marcene P., University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work

Gould, Estelle D., WTAE-TV

Gow, Steele, University of Pittsburgh, School of General Studies and Division of Instructional Experimentation

Greenlee, Charles E., Homewood Brushton Neighborhood Health Center

Hallen, Philip, Falk Medical Fund

Henderson, Donald M., University of Pittsburgh, Office of Provost

Holzner, Burkart, University of Pittsburgh, Department of Sociology

Jameson, Barbara B., University of Pittsburgh, University-Urban Interface Program

Jencka, Frank V., Parent Representatives, Pittsburgh Public Schools

Jenkins, Martin D., American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.

Jeter, Frankie, VISTA Office

Johnson, Norman, Carnegie-Mellon University, School of Urban and Public Affairs

Kish, Gabor, Pittsburgh Neighborhood Alliance

Knowles, William A., United Black Front

Laulicht, Jerome, University of Pittsburgh, Department of Sociology

Lazarsfeld, Paul, University of Pittsburgh, Department of Sociology

Lombardo, Daniel L., University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work

McCarren, John C., Roman Catholic Diocese of Pittsburgh

McLain, John H., Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh

Mitroff, Ian, University of Pittsburgh, School of Business and Learning Research and Development Center

Nehnevajsa, Jiri, University of Pittsburgh, Department of Sociology

Nelson, Wilbur L., United States Postal Service, Main Post Office

O'Brien, James E., Brashear Association

Pearlman, Eleanor G., United Mental Health

Perry, Diane, New Pittsburgh Courier

Pittenger, Rex A., University of Pittsburgh, School of Medicine, Staunton Clinic

Pois, Joseph, University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs

Posvar, W.W., University of Pittsburgh, Office of Chancellor

Robinson, James E., Pittsburgh Board of Education, Schenley High School

Rondeau, Giles, University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work

Salmon-Cox, Leslie, University of Pittsburgh, Division of Instructional Experimentation

Simonds, Edith M., Mini Corporation Association

Smeltz, Sandy, University of Pittsburgh, University-Urban Interface Program

Stenson, Kiernan, University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work

Thomas, Clarke M., Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

Tropman, Elmer J., Health and Welfare Association

Van Dusen, Albert C., University of Pittsburgh, Office of the Secretary

Wolford, Jack A., Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, Community Mental Health

Wynne, David, Goodwill Industries

Youngquist, C.R., Magee-Womens Hospital

IV. ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Introduction

The second University-Community Goals Forum was held November 18, 1971, and centered on issues related to the administration of justice. The background paper specific to that meeting was written by Dr. Matthew Holden, Jr., of the Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin. Dr. Holden previously served at the University of Pittsburgh and hence is familiar with this region. (Such familiarity was taken for granted with the other authors, all of them Pittsburgh residents of long duration.) Holden's paper focused much of its attention on aspects of the problem related to the police, the police-court interaction system, tensions stemming from racial cleavage, and some suggested options for reform.

Dr. Nehnevajsa's paper, written especially for this Forum, pointed to the fact that all of the community leaders responding to his study concerning Pittsburgh Goals ranked major changes in the criminal justice system very high on a list of priorities. A change in this system was ranked by these leaders both among the most desirable and among the most important. Interestingly, the likelihood of changes in the system had only a middle ranking on the average. Though two groups of leaders thought changes likely, several groups of leaders thought changes highly unlikely, and among these latter were leaders of Black Community Programs. Such a perceptual difference may, in fact, represent different realities, both "true." The fact that leaders in government and law see changes in the system as likely, and that black community leaders do not may be understood as a difference in what kind and how much change each of these groups was considering when they made their judgment

concerning likelihood. Nehnevajsa's brief remarks were exceedingly well attended, and in fact, may have served as something of a preface for the kinds of communication and dissension which followed during the day.

The Paper

Holden's paper, at 53 pages the longest of the four, set the stage for his discussion by opening with a section on "law and order." Beginning on a very general level by sketching various alternative definitions of objectives for the "law and order machinery," Holden moved on to two specific problem areas: " 'crime' in the more or less conventional sense and 'severe social (group) conflict,' of which the presently most advertised version concerns racial cleavage."*

In discussing "crime," Holden began by enumerating a typology of attitudes that people express toward legally defined crime. The point is that though a whole host of behaviors are legally criminal, only some are of the sort that raise indignation or even concern among most citizens. This being the case, "the criminal law machinery, which is designed chiefly to handle crime in the ordinary sense...actually handles only an important fraction of even that aspect of crime."** Linking this idea to his other major theme, severe group conflict, Holden pointed to three notions important to an understanding of the workings of the criminal law machinery:

1. Insofar as ordinary criminal law problems are concerned, people are likely to assume that whatever group is the "subordinate" population is the source of the criminal law problems that the dominant group perceives for itself, and

*Holden, p. 4.
**Ibid., p. 7.

thus to try to make the criminal law machinery into a containment machinery for this subordinate population . . .

2. The "sense of justice" of the subordinate population (in this instance, black) is likely to be grossly offended . . .
3. If group tension is very high, e.g., some emergency condition, then social dispute of this kind becomes a criminal law problem, simply because other public decision-makers will tend to vacate--tend to be forced to vacate--the field . . .***

Holden went on to contend that there has been little thought shown to ordinary criminal law problems and even less for the management of social conflict. Holden then proceeded to discuss some of the impediments to criminal law improvements, using extensive anecdotal material from his own experience and first-hand research. His discussion of the conditions under which the police work in major urban areas revealed an understanding of the role requirements and built-in frustrations of the job. He applied a systems analysis approach to understanding the relationship between the police, the courts, the District Attorney's office and other relevant offices and publics. The inherent contradiction in goals of the police, aiming for high arrest rates, and the District Attorney, looking for a respectable conviction rate, was discussed. The paper then zeroed in on information concerning two specific crimes: armed robbery and burglary. He used these "rational" crimes (i.e., non-impulsive) as a further jumping-off point for discussing societal attitudes to crime, and black-white interaction, vis-a-vis crime.

A concluding section made, at least, five important points: (1) crime and discussions about criminal behavior must be disassociated in

***Ibid., p. 8-9.

the public mind from discussions of interracial conflict. "In reality, criminal behavior, even if limited to (or particularly if limited to) the Index offenses is primarily an intraracial problem. It is chiefly an affair of white offenders against white victims, of black offenders against black victims, and of a small amount of interracial crime."+ He used this fact in conjunction with data on the higher amount of crime against blacks, as the basis for his argument that "equal protection of the laws does not yet extend into black communities."++ (2) "There is a need for much more serious attention to the incidence of white collar crime (fraud, etc.) as practiced in lower-income communities."+++ (3) There is a great need to select various sorts of crime on which to focus attention, and top among these must be offenses which cause extensive social harm, and are "rational," the latter characteristic meaning that some effective prevention-planning can be done. (4) The whole area of severe group conflict needs a great deal more attention, especially so that it does not evolve into an area of criminal behavior. (5) "A critical policy option is to seek early movement that would result in an arms-free metropolitan society, by building upon a series of short-term arms control and disarmament measures."++++ The paper closed with an eloquent discussion of the whys and wherefores of this fifth proposal--urban disarmament.

The Discussion

Following introductory remarks by others, Holden spoke about the major points of his paper. Given some delays in the mailing of papers

+Ibid., p. 42.
++Ibid., p. 43.
+++Ibid., p. 43.
++++Ibid., p. 44.

to participants, it was felt that perhaps not everyone in attendance had had ample time to read the papers carefully. Holden's talk received close attention, as did Nehnevajsa's summary of his survey's findings. The participants for this Forum, being a bit larger in number than anticipated, divided into four groups in order to keep group size at the discussion level. Discussion leaders were chosen from among the advisory group for the paper, and by late morning, the groups started up and the issues were joined.

Participants had been asked to structure their thinking around three kinds of questions: (1) What were the major issues in the area of administration of justice? (2) What sorts of solutions might be posed to problem areas, and what were the relative feasibility of these solutions? (3) What role, if any, might the University play in seeking solutions to problems? Holden's paper, of course, had not been structured along these lines, and so it was left to the participants, in discussion, to raise issues in addition to the paper and introductory remarks. As the day progressed, this proved to be no problem at all, and the number and kinds of issues raised were both extensive. In each of the groups, with some variation of tone and content, three major areas became the foci of discussion: the police--their training, behavior on the jobs, needs and frustrations; the courts--their proper functioning, current drawbacks and strategies for improvement; the law--what it is and what it might be. Not surprisingly, discussion of each of these areas was interwoven with two major themes: black-white relations and the role of education in any strategy for improvement.

Typical of the conversation regarding the police was the one begun in the morning in one of the groups. A minister asked the group to

consider, "Just what jobs do policemen perform?" and by implication, what jobs should they perform. He pointed to the number of "non-police" functions which must be carried out, e.g., ambulance driving. A township policeman reinforced this notion, and said that he thought the police were overburdened with such tasks. A University professor said that perhaps these functions served the purpose of improving police-community relations, and that this very necessary improvement was the major thrust of the President's Crime Report. She went on to say that the "control" of police behavior was the crucial issue, and that seeming lack of control is what causes police-community tensions. Taking up from some discussion on this point, another participant spoke of the difficulties in planning and carrying out a proper training program for the police. "How do you institute values?" he asked, in response to an example which cited the overzealous arrest of a black man by two white policemen. It was pointed out that training must include understanding of the community's values, that "trust" by the citizens, of the police, has been lost and must be reinstated. Later, it was suggested that colleges and universities play a role in the training process by helping to develop some standard of examination for policemen. Among other things, residence requirements must be invoked--policemen must be involved in their own communities.

When it came to discussing the courts, the police participants were among the most vocal. In one group, early discussion focused around the problems in Common Pleas Court. A policeman in that group said:

> Short time delays cause the police to lose cases. For example, you get situations where the policeman (and his witnesses) have to be in court, say at 9:00 a.m. The

> defendant does not arrive until 10:30. Then the judge arrives at 11:30. Due to the time differences, the police cannot hold on to their witnesses. As soon as the judge arrives, he adjourns for lunch.

A representative from Neighborhood Legal Services added to this by discussing the problem of civil action suits being filed against the police in criminal cases. It was this same representative who also pointed out that when entering Common Pleas Court, the District Attorney's office gets one file and the defendant's legal representative gets another--"It gives the appearance of a script being followed," he said. To add to these complaints, a representative of the Civic Club talked about what he saw as the problem of disclosure of the court calendar. In addition to there being ways of delaying sentencing until the officers are away and the witnesses are out of town, according to this representative, it can also be determined which judge is sitting when.

As for discussion of the "law," recommendations ran the gamut from conversation of individual forms of violation--e.g., drug law problems and enforcement--to major system overhaul, with special attention paid here to bail bond reform. (This, a topic of major discussion and change in the Pittsburgh region, received a lot of consideration in this Forum. Many participants in the Forum were also members of various groups actively seeking reform, and many brought their own group's problems and suggestions to the fore on the 18th.) One participant--a squire from a nearby township--felt that reform must begin with the State legislature--"the size of the legislature must be reduced and the quality of the State legislators be improved." He felt strongly that reform at the top would trickle down and lead eventually to reform at the minor judiciary level, an area vitally in need of change.

Throughout the day, what a university, or this University, can, should or would do was a constant topic of conversation. A frequently heard theme was that the University should not just educate, it should advocate. In response to that suggestion, a lawyer involved on the Federal level said that even if the University did not advocate, it should make its experts available to legislators or lobbyists, present them with facts and recommendations, and set up a clearinghouse of information. Time and again, it was said that the University must provide more education with respect to practical problems, more learning through experience. The University should be involved with community problems was the view of at least some of the participants. Especially, the University should be involved with the black community and its problems.

If there had been some suspicion voiced at the first Forum over "hidden agendas" or "What-is-the-University-really-up-to?" it was slight compared to the kinds of suspicions which were voiced at the second. The author of the background paper was black. One-half of the advisory group for the Forum was black. (Though the advisory group was chosen with the explicit notion that black communities and white communities should be represented, each member of the advisory group was chosen for the kind of role or status he held in civic affairs. The group included policemen, a police magistrate, civic leaders, a representative from the Human Relations Commission, several interested University people--a dozen people, in all, chosen for the relevance to the field. The group worked remarkably well in performing its task, notwithstanding vast individual differences in opinions of its members. It happened to be composed 50% black, 50% white.) Despite the racial diversity of the

talents brought to bear in planning the Forum, participants, especially black ones, were uneasy about the personnel of the project, the project's "real" aims, and its method of operations. There was a great deal of discussion during the day concerning the University's stance on issues related to the black community. It is not surprising, and undoubtedly appropriate, that such discussion should take place, particularly on a day devoted to thinking about the administration of justice. Some of the concerns of the day were never brought fully into the open--and so, it would be impossible to say that all concerns were alleviated. But even on these, unresolvable questions, opinions were gathered, discussion was held. If only because it provided a stage on which to hold such discussion, the Forum did accomplish something to promote communication. In this Forum, major questions revolved around general issues drawn on racial lines: What is the black input into these Forums, and what, if anything, will the black community derive?

Summary Discussion

This second Forum, focusing on Administration of Justice, brought together a diversity of people, and dividing them into small groups, put them around tables to talk together as they rarely do. In the late afternoon and early evening summary sessions, it was interesting to see how each of the groups had touched upon many of the same problems. But the range of recommendations was extensive, and defied easy summary. Holden, in his after-dinner talk, said he would not attempt such summary, or encapsulation. Rather, he reiterated the major points, and talked of the need for continuing communication and joint planning--University and communities.

The general recommendations included items such as the following:

a. beef up the D.A.'s force

b. use closed circuit TV for presentation of evidence (so that jury cannot see the accused)

c. more legal training for the police

d. more legal training for the public

e. new criteria for selecting and training police

f. increased proportion of black police officers

g. establishment of community courts, with qualified personnel, elected by community

h. bail bond reform--various plans

i. eliminate traffic violations from court, etc.

As for suggestions to the University, these boiled down to asking the University to educate, to advocate, to lobby, to serve, and/or to facilitate communication.

What only began to rise to the surface at this Forum became much clearer at the third: there is vast disagreement abroad about what a university can, will or should do with its resources. When it comes to people's health, and the delivery of health care services, there is probably no more volatile an issue today than that. This was the focus of Forum III, held in December.

ADVISORY GROUP - ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Harvey Adams, Jr.
Black Guardians
Pittsburgh Police Department

Gabriel Cocheres
Fraternal Order of Police
Pittsburgh Police Department

David Epperson
Dean, School of Social Work
University of Pittsburgh

Earl Harris
Magistrate, Police Court
City of Pittsburgh

Solis Horwitz
University Professor
University of Pittsburgh

Bill Moore
Black Guardians
Pittsburgh Police Department

John O'Keefe
Fraternal Order of Police
Pittsburgh Police Department

Charles Pleasant
Professor, Department of Sociology
Allegheny Community College, Boyce Campus

Richard Seeburger
Professor, School of Law
University of Pittsburgh

George Shankey
Civic Club of Allegheny County

Brian Vargus
Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology
University of Pittsburgh

Henry Woods
Mayor's Commission on Human Relations
City of Pittsburgh

FORUM II, THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, November 18, 1971

Abdullah, E. Elaine, Welfare Rights Organization

Adams, Harvey, Pittsburgh Police Department

Altenberger, Christine, University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs

Avery, Robert W., University of Pittsburgh, Department of Sociology

Baltimore, Charles, Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic

Baum, Martha, University of Pittsburgh, University-Urban Interface Program

Brictson, Robert, University of Pittsburgh, Research Programs, Office of the Secretary

Brown, John, University of Pittsburgh, Special Programs Office

Carter, Alice E., Urban League of Pittsburgh

Clanagan, Mazzetta, University of Pittsburgh, Admissions Office

Cocheres, Gabriel, Pittsburgh Police Department

Coleman, Alan M., University of Pittsburgh, Department of Sociology

Colville, Robert, Pittsburgh Police Department

Craig, Homer C., Pittsburgh Police Department

Crocker, Walter, Public Safety Commission

Dauer, Robert E., City of Pittsburgh (Magistrate)

Edwards, Trevor, University of Pittsburgh, School of Law

Epperson, David, University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work

Fedel, Arthur H., University of Pittsburgh, School of General Studies

Feig, Konnilyn, University of Pittsburgh, Special Programs Office

Gagetta, Vince, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

Gil, Joseph, University of Pittsburgh, Security Department

Ginsberg, Charlotte, Women in the Urban Crisis

Gow, Steele, University of Pittsburgh, School of General Studies and Division of Instructional Experimentation

Harper, Robert B., Pittsburgh Police Department

Holden, Matthew, University of Wisconsin, Department of Political Science

Holzner, Anne S., American Friends Service Committee

Horwitz, Solis, University of Pittsburgh

Jarema, Christina M., University of Pittsburgh, University-Urban Interface Program

Jacoby, Liva H., University of Pittsburgh, University-Urban Interface Program

Jameson, Barbara, University of Pittsburgh, University-Urban Interface Program

Karns, John, University of Pittsburgh, Department of Sociology

King, Ralph, National Conference of Christians and Jews

Knight, John H., University of Pittsburgh, School of Law

Levitt, Steve C., Stuyvesant Insurance Company

McCormick, Joseph P. II, University of Pittsburgh, Department of Political Science

McIlvane, Donald W., Catholic Interracial Council

Massaro, Gerald N., Governor's Justice Commission

Melman, Mrs. Dale, Police Citizen's Council

Miller, Monroe J., University of Pittsburgh, Department of Psychology

Morrison, David, R., University of Pittsburgh, School of Law

Nehnevajsa, Jiri, University of Pittsburgh, Department of Sociology

Newell, Barbara, University of Pittsburgh, Provost's Office

O'Keefe, John R., Pittsburgh Police Department

O'Laughlin, Johanna, University of Pittsburgh, School of Law

Owen, Raymond E., University of Pittsburgh, Department of Political Science

Pappas, Phillip, Community Human Services Corporation

Paull, Barbara, University of Pittsburgh, University Times

Platz, Otto P., Bethel Park Police

Pleasant, Charles R., Allegheny Community College

Posvar, W.W., University of Pittsburgh, Office of the Chancellor

Potts, James W., Mt. Lebanon Township Police Department

Ray, James E., University and City Ministries

Regan, Bernard, Justice of the Peace, Allegheny County

Reilly, Michael J., City of Pittsburgh

Rial, Elizabeth L., University of Pittsburgh, School of Law

Rodgers, June, Y.M.C.A.

Ross, George H., Office of Public Defender

Salmon-Cox, Leslie, University of Pittsburgh, Division of Instructional Experimentation

Schermer, Marc A., All-City Student Council

Seeburger, Richard, University of Pittsburgh, School of Law

Shankey, George W., Civic Club of Allegheny County

Stein, Herbert G., WQED

Stroud, D. Michael, University of Pittsburgh, School of Law

Swanson, Leonard A., WIIC-TV Corporation

Taber, Joseph J., University of Pittsburgh, Department of Chemistry

Taylor, Ronald C., Carnegie-Mellon University, Security Department

Thomas, Jean W., League of Women Voters

Thornburgh, Richard L., United States Attorney (Western Pennsylvania)

Trellis, Emil S., Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic

Udin, Sala, Ile Elegba

Van Dusen, Albert C., University of Pittsburgh, Office of the Secretary

Wander, Harvey, Professional Bondsman

Wettick, Stanton, Neighborhood Legal Services

Willem, Victor S., HGGH Council Inc.

Winters, James R., Y.M.C.A.

Woods, Harvey, Mayor's Commission on Human Rights

V. THE DOMAIN OF HEALTH

Introduction

The third University-Community Goals Forum was undoubtedly the most provocative, and provoking, of the series. Concentrating on the subject "The University and the Community in the Domain of Health," the paper and day-long discussion touched on issues close to the center of everyone's concerns. Whether practitioner or layman, everyone is a consumer of health services, and it would appear, no one is satisfied with the current status of these services. Focusing on university-community interface in this area resulted in the most sharply defined pitting of one group against the other that was to take place in any of the four Forums. Community participants were the most outspoken in this discussion, their grievances lengthy, their demands most fully articulated. University participants were divided, most on an individual basis, between their need to defend and explain a system more intricate than is generally understood, and their inevitable agreement with much of what was voiced by the community. (It should be noted that the University of Pittsburgh is the only university in the region with medical and other health schools. This helps to explain why Pitt is seen as such a "target" and also why "university" is frequently capitalized in the text.)

As a coming together of two groups of people accustomed to perceiving problems quite differently, the entire discussion might be seen as a microcosm of the kind of interaction that takes place when laymen and experts meet on any problem of a serious and pressing nature. One group wants, and feels it has a right to expect, immediate solutions

from institutions "obviously" prepared to dispense these; the other group knows more clearly the limitations of the institution, is accustomed to thinking in terms of more programmatic, long-term solutions, and is nowhere near as angry. Inevitably, though much was explored, and much recommended, making for a provocative discussion, nothing was solved, nor appeared ready to be--which, in itself, provided a heightened sense of frustration for many who participated.

The Paper

The background paper for the Forum on December 9, 1971, was written by Dr. Waldo Treuting, Chairman of the Department of Public Health Practice, and by Dr. William Hall, of Public Health and Social Work, as well as by Mr. Michael Baizerman, Senior Research Associate, Maternal and Child Health. Though the paper had as referrent the "Domain of Health," its major focus was on issues of the "interface." The authors set out to explore what an interface is, or might be, and some salient characteristics of the participants who meet at the interface. A first part of the paper dealt in the more general concepts, while a second introduced material relevant to the domain of health care, though specific issues and questions were not wrestled with, these were left to the day's discussion.

In taking on the subjects of health care, the University, and the community, the authors were dealing with the only subject in the series of four which had a direct and real base in actuality. The University does comprise as part of its whole schools of Medicine, Health Related Professions, Public Health and Nursing. It does have an affiliation with, and operational part to play in, several hospital facilities in its own neighborhood, Oakland. The University is perceived, by the community,

as a provider of health services. The authors, taking these things into account, as well as the use the University makes of community resources, especially people for its training and research, attempted to clarify some of the mutual expectations universities and communities levy upon each other. They defined the interface as

> those expectations of behavior held in common by those in the university and those outside of it on what each can offer the other, and on how they can "work together." Second, the interface is the act of working together; and third, it is the relationship which results from joint effort.*

In the area of health, the authors pointed out, these expectations have to do with direct care, rehabilitation and preventive medicine. The expectations are concerned as well with questions of payment and personnel, place and method of delivery. It is not uncommon, the authors pointed out, for universities and surrounding communities to have different expectations, or at the least, different sets of priorities within their expectations. While a university may, for a whole set of sound and proven reasons, place education and scholarship ahead of service obligations--and in fact view service as primarily a vehicle for teaching and research--community people view the situation differently. They see a large, modern, complex, seemingly affluent set of institutions, and they see large gaps in service delivery. They wonder why the institutions can't meet these needs. The authors detailed the various views of the community held by university members, as well as views of the university projected by community people, particularly in the domain of health. Toward the end of their paper, the authors summarized some of their own views of what each party might offer to the other. But the

*Treuting, p. 18.

final paragraphs of the paper brought it around full circle to the opening section and posed a series of questions for discussion. Of the four papers, this was the least content oriented, the most process oriented. Though the paper dealt with issues at least one level of abstraction away from the everyday world, it touched nerves jangled from everyday experiences. Judging from the discussion on the day of the Forum, the paper well served its stated purpose of provocation of thought.

The Discussion

The dominant theme running through the day's discussion, in all groups, was the statement that if the University is going to do anything that involves the community--and the hope was expressed that it would do many things--then community people must be part of the planning. There was no suspicion voiced at this Forum over the possibility of a "hidden agenda," as there had been before. Rather, what the participants were saying was, of course, you need our help and our opinions, we should have established this communication process a long time ago. A few people present questioned whether it was possible, or even desirable, for the University to attempt to deal with even some of the health needs of the community, but most never questioned this. There was a loudly voiced assumption that the University had the resources, had the people and the know-how, and that it must, as a moral imperative, use these to help people in the immediate surrounding communities. One community worker, in a not atypical question, asked what she was supposed to tell a mother with a sick child, or others in need of help, when they couldn't get what they want or need, yet are surrounded by large buildings presumably in the business of dispensing health care. A member of the University's dental school said that if community people will accept only fully

trained personnel, then some other agencies will have to contribute because the University alone cannot afford to serve all such health needs.

Many community people expressed their anger at being used, as they saw it, as guinea pigs. There was a widespread feeling that when, for the purposes of research or training, the University needs the community, it makes use of it. However, what the community needs or wants has not been the basis for planning or action at any time. Various members of the community, from social agencies and business and education, pointed to a variety of things the University might do: help to influence and design the curriculum of public school health training, coordinate community resources, train new forms of professionals and paraprofessionals, work with other universities, in Pittsburgh and elsewhere, on the design and coordination of health services. Along with the discussion of many such proposals, was a simultaneous discussion of money. Clearly, in the eyes of many in the community, the University is rich enough to be of far more service than it has ever been. Equally clearly, many from the University feel a constant lack of funds, a great inadequacy of money to do much that they feel is important. Again, these two perceptions of the same actual situation reflect the different realities, as well as misconceptions and priorities, of the lay and professional groups participating. Discussion of specifics continued through the afternoon, and in the late afternoon feedback session each of the groups had many suggestions to make. After dinner, there was a lengthy session, on a more general level, and that produced one or two very concrete and far-reaching recommendations.

Summary Discussion

Suggestions made at the group feedback session covered many topics, some of them only tangentially related to the field of health care, e.g., "the University should work to erase racism." There were suggestions concerning education, especially for young children, and many made reference to the need for community-University interaction. The University was called upon to organize community health services, as well as to reorder its own priorities regarding the allocation of funds in the health area. It was suggested that Learning Centers be established in the community, where students might get training, and people, services. In conjunction with that last, it was suggested that the community be educated to accept health services from a variety of personnel and not insist always on full-fledged physicians. One group went so far as to suggest that the University of Pittsburgh take national leadership in pressing for health solutions, and do so by arranging a meeting between Chancellor Posvar and President Nixon, wherein the Chancellor might press his case. Other recommendations included: establishing a liaison with the State Health Department, and directly providing scientific information to the legislature; redesigning the training given doctors and nurses, to make them more community-oriented; and a host of suggestions concerning the establishment of a real community-University interface. This last topic became the sharp focus of the after-dinner discussion.

The session after dinner was the longest and fullest of those held in this series of Forums. Dr. Treuting spent most of the pre-dinner session in meeting with the group leaders, ascertaining in detail what the issues had been and what might be fruitful lines for discussion

later. In that discussion community people were outspoken in their desires for changes in University policy. The long session can be summarized by the following list of requests levied on the University:

a. Community people could not say more loudly or often how important it is to them to have health professionals who will work with them, not on them, or for them.

b. It was suggested that a review committee should exist within the University to evaluate all proposals for field work, intern training, etc. (e.g., all "using" the community programs) as well as any planning activities that would impact the community in any way. It was also suggested that perhaps there should be such committees within each school that has programs in the community, rather than a single University-wide body.

c. In connection with the setting up of a University committee as described above, there should be established a panel of consultants from the community to work with University personnel. Several of those present at the Forum suggested that they would form the nucleus of such a group and would be in a position to recruit other members from the community as needed.

d. The University should establish a long-range policies committee regarding University-community interface, and this committee should set broad policy guidelines and its recommendations should become governing policy.

e. Finally, it was suggested that this very group present at the Forum should be reconvened in six months to a year in order to review the progress made on these proposals.

The day closed on a meeting which had aroused strong and very mixed feelings. Clearly, many who came and were vocal participants were enthusiastic about the opportunity they had had to make inputs. Many were discouraged that the day's deliberations could not produce immediate action. Many from the University left with a heightened sense of frustration--more keenly aware than before of community wants and needs, stronger in their anticipation that University resources could not meet all of these, and perplexed as to the source and direction of solutions.

ADVISORY GROUP - THE DOMAIN OF HEALTH

Mrs. Mattie Addis
Child Guidance Center
201 DeSoto Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Mr. Davitt Bell
Edgewater Corporation
College and Allegheny
Oakmont, Pennsylvania

Mrs. Dorothy Bellas
55 Cust Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15207

Dr. Herschel Griffin
Dean, Graduate School of Public Health
110 Parran Hall
University of Pittsburgh

Dr. John Hitchcock
W.P.I.C.
O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Mr. George McGlomb
Regional Medical Program
3530 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Dr. Gerald C. St. Denis
Associate Res. Professor
Graduate School of Public Health
University of Pittsburgh

Dr. James Stewart
Mercy Hospital
Stevenson and Locust Streets
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

Mr. John Tomayko
United Steelworkers of America
1500 Commonwealth Building
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

Mr. Byron Wight, Professor
A 618 Crabtree Hall
Graduate School of Public Health
University of Pittsburgh

FORUM III, THE DOMAIN OF HEALTH, December 9, 1971

Addis, Mattie B., Terrace Village Health Center

Avery, Mildred, Allegheny County Health Department

Baizerman, Michael L., University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public Health

Baum, Martha K., University of Pittsburgh, University-Urban Interface Program

Bell, Davitt S., Edgewater Steel Corporation

Bellas, Dorothy L., Presbyterian Hospital

Bostic, Raymond L., Sickle Cell Society

Brictson, Robert C., University of Pittsburgh, Research Programs, Office of the Secretary

Cashman, Harold H., M.D., Allegheny County Health Department

Cheever, F. Sargent, M.D., University of Pittsburgh, Office of Vice Chancellor of the Health Professions

Dean, Charles W., University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public Health

Doaks, Joan M., University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public Health

Durocher, Roy T., D.D.S., University of Pittsburgh, School of Dental Medicine

Duzak, Thomas F., United Steelworkers of America

Esposito, Jerry, Allegheny County Emergency and Health Services Center

Evosevic, Bosanka, Pittsburgh Public Schools

Falk, Sigo, Chatham Center Incorporated

France, Renay, Allegheny County Health Department

Garson, Warfield, United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund

Goldberg, Irwin, Montefiore Hospital

Gow, Steele, University of Pittsburgh, School of General Studies and Division of Instructional Experimentation

Greenlee, Charles, M.D., Homewood Health Center

Griffin, Herschel E., University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public Health

Haydn, Katherine P., Community Action Pittsburgh

Hitchcock, John, M.D., University of Pittsburgh, Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic

Jameson, Barbara B., University of Pittsburgh, University-Urban Interface Program

Jones, Frank V., Terrace Village Health Center

Kane, Daniel A., Montefiore Hospital and University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public Health

Lazarsfeld, Paul, University of Pittsburgh, Department of Sociology

Lesesne, Lillie M., Allegheny County Health Department

McClung, Elmer, Sickle Cell Society

McDermott, Charles F., D.D.S.

McGrady, John E., Jr., Blue Cross

Michalak, Judith L., Allegheny County Health Department

Mitchell, John M., Alcoa

Montgomery, William R., University of Pittsburgh, Community and Urban Relations (Health)

Newell, Barbara W., University of Pittsburgh, Office of Provost

Novick, Mrs. James, Pittsburgh School Board

O'Connor, Robert B., United States Steel Corporation

Pascasio, Anne, University of Pittsburgh, School of Health Relations

Pierce, Henry W., Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

Pittenger, Rex A., M.D., University of Pittsburgh, Staunton Clinic

Posvar, W.W., University of Pittsburgh, Office of the Chancellor

Ricci, Edmund M., University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public Health

Rieker, Patricia P., University of Pittsburgh, Department of Sociology

Rome, Walter J., M.D., Children's Hospital

Salmon-Cox, Leslie, University of Pittsburgh, Division of Instructional Experimentation

Schaefer, Marguerite J., University of Pittsburgh, School of Nursing

Shapira, Frieda G., University of Pittsburgh, Board of Visitors, School of General Studies

Sieverts, Steven, M.D., Hospital Planning Association

Sissman, Isaac, D.D.S.

Sniderman, Marvin, D.D.S., Editor, Pennsylvania Dental Journal

Steinberg, Abraam, M.D.

Thomas, Clarke M., Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

Thompson, Douglas S., M.D., University of Pittsburgh, Magee-Womens Hospital

Tive, Tova, United Family Services

Treuting, W.L., M.D., University of Pittsburgh, Public Health Practice

Tropman, Elmer J., Health and Welfare Association

Turner, Dorcas, Presbyterian Hospital

Van Dusen, Albert C., University of Pittsburgh, Office of Secretary of the University and University-Urban Interface Program

Wallis, G. Edward, KDKA and KDKA-TV

Ware, Grace E., Pennsylvania Department of Health

Washington, Margaret S., Mercy Hospital

Wight, Byron W., University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public Health

VI. GOALS AND GOVERNMENT OF THE METROPOLIS

Introduction

The fourth and final Forum, with the Christmas season intervening, was held over until February. That scheduling happily had the consequence of making the topic, "Goals and Government of the Metropolis," particularly timely, because state legislation granting local home rule was then nearing action in the General Assembly and public interest in restructuring of government was relatively high. Indeed, another conference on urban government was held at a downtown hotel the same day, but participation in this fourth Forum still was at least as strong as it had been in the earlier three.

On the other hand, the mood of the interest and participation was quite critical of local government as it exists and not at all optimistic as to what it might become. Dr. Nehnevajsa's Goals Survey, of course, had found that, among "influentials," the importance and desirability of instituting metropolitan government was rated high but that the likelihood of it being achieved was rated low. In addition, the Goals Survey had found a deep disillusionment with the effectiveness of local government generally and a feeling that strong and purposeful governmental leadership was lacking in the community. Still active memories of the days of the R. K. Mellon-David Lawrence alliance made the present situation look especially weak by comparison. As was to be expected, then, this Forum's participants approached the subject of "Goals and Government of the Metropolis" with a good deal of skepticism and negativism.

The background paper prepared by Dr. Steele Gow, Dean of the University's School of General Studies and Division of Instructional Experimentation, tried to focus this known discontent on constructive possibilities

for improving the structure and operation of local government as an important and often essential means for pursuing community goals. It already was clear from the previous Forums as well as from the Goals Survey that most of the many problems and issues of the urban complex required government involvement in their resolution, so that this Forum could be expected to catch some of the fall-out from the preceding ones and to serve as a rather natural culminating session of the series, and that proved to be pretty much the case.

The Paper

As a sociologically inclined political scientist, Gow attempted in his background paper to consider the underlying character of this and other metropolitan communities as well as their governmental institutions. In its opening section, the paper pointed out the paradox of a greater and greater proportion of our people gathering together in these large metropolitan complexes while, at the same time, complaining more and more bitterly of the poor quality of urban life and of the so-called "urban crisis" of modern society. While cities have long been with us, the paper pointed out, these huge and sprawling metropolises are something new enough in the human experience that we still need to learn how to live satisfactorily in them, need to discover or invent new ways of handling the new problems they create as well as the old urban problems they inherit from the more confined city proper. As a consequence, the paper's first section argued, we need to look at the phenomenon of metropolitan development over the last half century or so and, from that background, dare to re-examine and rather boldly re-think our traditional patterns and practices of urban local government.

The paper then in subsequent sections focused on the Greater Pittsburgh area to review, as a case study, the long and complex history of efforts to rationalize the government of this metropolitan complex. It first recounted a series of efforts which culminated in the late 1920's in a major campaign to institute a form of federated metropolitan government comprehending the central city and the rest of the urbanized county. Although the state constitution was amended, a charter drafted, and a county-wide referendum held that resulted in a better than two-thirds favorable vote of the citizens, that all-out effort was frustrated by a "joker" clause in the enabling act which required as well a two-thirds majority in a majority of the more than 100 local government jurisdictions within the county, and the charter narrowly failed to get that. Although the state constitution then was re-amended to eliminate the "joker" clause by requiring only a majority in a majority of the units, each succeeding metro charter campaign was blocked farther and farther short of its goal until, shortly before World War II, one failed even to find a member of the General Assembly to sponsor the necessary legislation. And after World War II, even with the metropolitan area's suburban development boom of the period, another major effort failed to generate action on the title provision of a study called "A Home Rule Charter for Allegheny County." Some of the experiential roots of the disillusionment with local politics and government were thus laid bare.

The paper went on to examine some alternatives to "metro," including the assumption by the old-style and loose-jointed county government of more municipal-type functions, the proliferation of special purpose authorities outside the general government, and the resort to non-governmental planning and coordinating organizations exemplified here by the Allegheny Conference on Community Development and its associated organizations. The paper

argued that, while each of the alternative approaches or ways of bypassing the "metro" issue had helped solve particular problems, they also had contributed to the weakening of public confidence in the democratically responsive general governmental system of the metropolis.

Finally, the paper sought to draw as implications from the metropolitan community's experience and conditioning, a range of current possibilities for enabling the citizenry to pursue community goals more effectively. Three were suggested as a means to give focus and direction for the Forum's discussion:

1. That the then pending home rule legislation, while restricted in its grants of power and in its inducements to overcome fragmentation of government in the metropolis, was nevertheless a practical possibility - as nothing more powerful seemed to be - for working out a rational and effective system of government for the urban complex.
2. Alternatively, that the modern metropolis was such a different phenomenon from anything in our social past and was so rapidly developing a one that something much more radical needed to be devised, that what was required was a new concept of metropolitan government which could expand readily as the sprawl proceeded and could adapt readily to changing sub-communities within the metropolis.
3. Or, to the contrary, that the best hope lay not in formal governments at all but in the multiplication and expansion of non-governmental planning and coordinating organizations, with more elements of the citizenry participating in their versions of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development and with broad community consensus developing out of the competition among these organizations.

The paper sought - with indifferent success, as it proved - to focus the multi-faceted discontent with the quality of life in the urban complex upon the governmental system as a basic means for formulating public policy and mobilizing resources to pursue community goals.

The Discussion

Although the roster of participants included government officials and leaders accustomed to working with government agencies, the discussion throughout reflected much cynicism and pessimism regarding the prospect of achieving community goals through local government action. Pettiness and bickering and bureaucratic lethargy appeared to be pretty much accepted as irremedial behavioral characteristics of local government and, with only few exceptions, the participants voiced no confidence in any reform strategy aimed at making the governmental system of the metropolis more effective.

The three propositions presented in the background paper, for instance, were largely dismissed. The first (the pending home-rule legislation) was considered unlikely to make any significant difference even if adopted, because it had been so compromised to allay the fears of various vested interests. The second (the more radically adaptive-to-change model) was considered utterly impractical in a community which had repeatedly failed to establish even a county-based federated form of metro government. And the third (the non-governmental associated-interests route) was given little attention except to note that something of the sort seemed to be occurring among the poor, the blacks and other heretofore unorganized interests. Instead of maintaining the intended focus, the discussion soon became diffused as participants registered their varied views on the shortcomings of modern urban life.

As the day's discussion proceeded, however, the remarks tended to cluster around at least three issues which could be interpreted collectively as a new

focus not a whole lot unlike the one intended although less pointed toward possible action.

Lack of strong and charismatic leadership, for example, was alleged and bemoaned by many of the participants. And it was suggested, although not seriously debated, that the fragmentation of governmental units in the metropolis and the absence of any government commensurate with the metropolitan community through which to pursue community-wide goals provided a situation in which it was difficult for real leadership to emerge. Several participants pointed out that the political party no longer seemed to work as it once had as a cohesive force to overcome fragmentation and that business elite leadership no longer was as readily accepted as it had been. There was speculation that basic changes in societal relationships were making old forms and sources of leadership obsolete and that, if new forms and sources were coming, they were not yet clearly recognizable, resulting in the sense of leaderlessness in the community.

Another much discussed issue was that of how community services are to be financed. Again the issue was related to fragmentation of government in the metropolis, with its inequalities in tax bases and in the resources to support services among the constituent units of the metropolis. However, the discussion did not lead toward proposals to reconstruct the metropolis government so much, but rather assumed that the state or national governments through their more comprehensive taxing powers needed to provide for the equalization. There seemed to be unanimity in the view that the general property tax had seen its day as the principal and almost sole base for tax support of local government and that new sources, probably tapped indirectly through revenue sharing from higher levels of government, were necessary and could be expected. It was pointed out by some that such a development would tend to weaken rather than enhance the power of local

governments, but that consideration appeared to weigh less heavily than the need for new revenues.

The third matter around which much discussion clustered was that of the changing nature of community and sub-community in the metropolitan area. Some concentrated on the much greater geographic area over which the modern mode of urban life was spread, so that this particular metropolis might better be viewed as possibly a nine-county, certainly a four-county area, rather than the one-county area for which metro campaigns of the past were organized. Some emphasized the development of homogenous groupings of people in both suburban retreats and inner-city enclaves, which often divide the governmental jurisdiction into several distinguishable sub-communities having less in common among themselves than each has with other like sub-communities in other governmental jurisdictions. Again, however, the discussion of this matter did not lead to any consensual recommendations for restructuring local government, although a few individual participants felt strongly that the observations obviously pointed in that direction and one participant offered his own rather elaborate scheme for rationalizing government over an extended (nine-county) area.

Summary Discussion

The evening session's discussion was steered toward consideration of what if anything ought to be done - by existing governments, by other interests or groups dissatisfied with the existing governmental system of the metropolitan community, or by such institutions as urban universities. Nothing approaching consensus appeared as regards the first two. However, there was general agreement that an urban university could render a relevant community service in two ways: 1) by acting as convenor of mixed discussion groups such as the Forums had been in order to encourage discussion across interest

group lines and facilitate the formulation of goals that most of the community could share, and 2) by collaborating with the community in maintaining a pool of expertise to be applied to urban problems and to the means for working toward community goals.

On the other hand, this discussion also included some forcefully worded cautions against a university or any other institution of the community assuming that it knew what was best for the community. Particularly strong was the indictment of much of what universities saw as community service but what others saw as "using" the community in one sense or another.

ADVISORY GROUP - METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT

Mrs. Shirley Bramhall
Deputy Director of Community Planning
Department of Planning, City of Pittsburgh

Mr. Edward Cooke
Treasurer, Allegheny County

Dr. William Cooper
Dean, School of Urban and Public Affairs
Carnegie-Mellon University

Mr. James Cunningham
Associate Professor, School of Social Work
University of Pittsburgh

Dr. David Henderson
Director, Buhl Foundation

Dr. Joseph James, Professor
Graduate School of Public and International Affairs
University of Pittsburgh

Mrs. Caryl Kline
Director, Continuing Education for Women
University of Pittsburgh

Mr. Charles Lieberth
Area Director
Department of Housing and Urban Development

Dr. Raymond Owen
Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science
University of Pittsburgh

Mr. Richard Thornburgh
United States Attorney

Mr. Lou Tronzo
Assistant Director
Government Relations and Public Affairs
University of Pittsburgh

FORUM IV, GOALS AND GOVERNMENT OF THE METROPOLIS, February 24, 1972

Adams, Michael A., The Pittsburgh Press

Baskin, Philip, Attorney

Baum, Martha, University of Pittsburgh, University-Urban Interface Program

Blumstein, Alfred, Carnegie-Mellon University, School of Urban and Public Affairs

Bramhall, Billie, City Planning Department

Brictson, Robert C., University of Pittsburgh, Research Programs, Office of the Secretary

Burger, Mary Lou, University of Pittsburgh, University Times

Charlton, George N., Jr., Pittsburgh Model Cities

Cooke, Edward F., Office of County Treasurer

Cooper, William, Carnegie-Mellon University, School of Urban and Public Affairs

Coppola, Betty L., Pittsburgh Model Cities

Cunningham, James, University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work

Epperson, David, University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work

Froehlich, William R.B., Southwestern Pennsylvania Regional Planning Commission

Goggin, Jay, Urban Redevelopment Authority

Gow, Steele, University of Pittsburgh, School of General Studies and Division of Instructional Experimentation

Henderson, David, Buhl Foundation

Hennessy, Thomas A., Pittsburgh Forum

James, Joseph, University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs

Jameson, Barbara, University of Pittsburgh, University-Urban Interface Program

Jarema, Christina M., University of Pittsburgh, University-Urban Interface Program

Kelly, James, State Representative, McCandless Township

Kline, Caryl M., University of Pittsburgh, Continuing Education for Women

Knox, James W., Allegheny County Housing Authority

Kobosky, Bernard J., University of Pittsburgh, Office of Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs

Lazarsfeld, Paul, University of Pittsburgh, Department of Sociology

McCarthy, Robert V., Dardanell Publications

McFadden, Daniel H., University of Pittsburgh, Office of Program Development and Public Affairs

McLain, John H., Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh

Mason, Louis, Jr., Pittsburgh City Council

Milberger, John N., Allegheny County Model Cities

Nehnevajsa, Jiri, University of Pittsburgh, Department of Sociology

Owen, Raymond E., University of Pittsburgh, Department of Political Science

Parker, H. Sheldon, State Representative, Mt. Lebanon

Posvar, W.W., University of Pittsburgh, Office of the Chancellor

Salmon-Cox, Leslie, University of Pittsburgh, Division of Instructional Experimentation

Scully, Sr. Jane, Carlow College, Office of the President

Shankey, George W., Civic Club of Allegheny County

Stark, William, Penn Overall Companies

Stone, Donald C., University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs

Thomas, Clarke, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette

Thomas, Jean W., League of Women Voters, National Board

Tokar, Joseph R., Joseph R. Tokar Insurance

Tronzo, Louis, University of Pittsburgh, Office of Governmental Relations

Tuden, Agnes, League of Women Voters

Van Dusen, Albert C., University of Pittsburgh, Office of the Secretary

Wertz, Ronald W., The Hillman Foundation, Inc.

Winn, Ulysses, Pittsburgh Model Cities

VII. GUIDLINES GLEANED FROM THE FORUM SERIES

Each of the Forums, as indicated in the reports on them in the preceding chapters, produced suggestions for action in its specific field. In addition, though, all of them dealt, directly or indirectly, with the more general issue of what should be an urban university's posture and procedures for working on community problems and helping achieve community goals. The Project's steering committee had decided that, rather than have one Forum assigned to deal especially with this more general issue, each of the specific-topic Forums almost inevitably and more naturally would get into the general issue anyway. Then, whatever emerged in common from all four could be considered more reliable than what a single separate Forum might produce. The steering committee's expectations were fulfilled, and there did emerge from all four certain common guidelines. This final chapter will attempt to extract from the several Forums and present four of these common guidelines, and it will also try to define a related area in which community and university participants remained in disagreement.

1. In whatever they do about community problems and goals, urban universities need to be very sensitive to and be guided by the distinction between doing something <u>with</u> the community and doing something <u>to</u> it or--paternalistically--<u>for</u> it.

Some of the sharpest criticism of the universities in every one of the Forums was rooted in what community participants considered to be the presumptuousness of university persons in deciding unilaterally what would be good for the community and then trying to do that to or for the community. Community participants made clear that they felt

that they or others like them had to be fully and truly in a collaborative relationship from the outset of and throughout any community improvement projects the universities were to undertake. The university persons' intentions could be quite sincerely to do good for the community and the results of their efforts even could be in fact good for the community, but there still would be resentment unless the community was treated as a collaborator.

2. What universities need to address themselves to, if they are to earn any credit in the community for rendering community service, are real problems or goals that their particular communities have and recognize that they have, and there is not this kind of credit to be earned (although there are other kinds to be earned) by doing research of general scholarly value on the community.

True, the community takes pride in the scholarly achievements of the faculties of its universities and in their contributions to the general fund of human knowledge. But this is not interpreted in the community as rendering a community service. It especially is not when a project is "sold" to the community as aiming to render a community service and then turns out to be another instance of "using" the community as an object of study or research eventuating in a journal article. The community expects university persons to do research that uses the community and within limits approves that, but it resents that being called by a university a community service when that particular community gets no more, or no more direct, benefit from it than do all other communities or society in general. The community tends to put a much more narrowly practical interpretation on the term community service than do most university persons.

3. The unorganized, usually less articulate and less clearly influential elements of the community need to have their share of the real power of governing university-community collaborative projects and not just be invited to advise or be consulted, if universities are to earn credit in their communities as more than one more tool of the "establishment."

Universities find it relatively easy, the community participants indicated they felt, to collaborate with businesses, with well recognized civic organizations, with governments and the like. They find it more difficult, as do other institutions, to identify and involve those who are not associated with recognized and established organizations. However, community participants stressed that the universities need to strive to overcome the difficulty, that they have an obligation to lead the way in the community's moving toward broader participation. Principally this has to do with involving racial minorities and the poor, but it also has to do with youth and the aged and other segments of the population which may include important client groups for services. Also, it was made clear that involvement means more than being consulted or called on for advice that might or might not be taken; it means sharing in the power, in the decision-making and priority-setting. Otherwise, what purports to be community service will be looked upon by a large proportion of community residents as one part of the "establishment" (a university) serving another part of the same "establishment."

4. Each of the Forums, to one degree or another, drew from the above three points the implication that urban universities and colleges should enter into a partnership with their communities to establish jointly governed organizations through which to engage in collaborative community service and the pursuit of community goals.

Institutions of higher education tend to be quite decentralized operationally, with schools, departments and even individual professors relating to the community in quite different, often confusing, and sometimes conflicting ways. This causes much frustration and inefficiency for both the community and the higher education institutions. Needed, the Forum participants indicated, is some sort of formally organized bridging device, some agency the specific business of which was to reach in one direction into the pool of talent and other relevant resources of the universities and in the other direction into the same of the community and to mobilize from both sources what was needed to solve problems and pursue goals of the community. The council or governing body of the agency would have to be truly representative enough and its methods of determining what the community's problems and goals are would have to be such that its program and activities could be widely accepted as conforming to the three preceding guidelines. While some more specific structural and procedural suggestions were presented in some of the Forums, the discussions produced no real consensus beyond these general terms.

Obviously the Forums did not produce a detailed plan of action and probably, given their size and composition and duration, could not be expected to do so. However, these four guidelines do point rather consistently in a direction somewhat different from that in which attempted collaborations between urban universities and their communities have customarily headed. More in-depth and sustained exploration in this somewhat different direction is called for and probably some other means than more Forums of this type is needed for the further exploration. Perhaps something that might be conceived as the progenitor of the council

or governing body of a university-community collaboration agency can be organized to carry on the sustained and in-depth planning of the sort of operating agency indicated.

However, such further efforts in whatever form will have to contend with one large area of misunderstanding between universities and their communities, which these Forums did little if anything to resolve. Community participants in the Forums, or many of them, tended to view the financial resources of the universities as a general pool of funds, pretty much available for allocation to community service and other uses according to a priority ordering that the universities were free to establish. From that view, it would follow that the more seriously the universities took their community service role (or the more community pressure was brought to bear on the universities), the greater the proportion of university financial and other resources would be assigned to support of community services. On the other hand, university participants, or more of them, tended to see the great bulk of their institutions' resources as being collected by or awarded to them for other uses, and the diversion of those resources to community services as being morally if not legally forbidden. For instance, they saw tuition income and government appropriations to reduce tuition as being earmarked for support of instruction, and research grants and contracts as being meant to support specific endeavors, which leaves very little if anything for the universities to allocate from general funds for support of community services. The university personnel's view was that <u>additional</u> funds, from the community or from the State specifically for the purpose or from other outside sources, was necessary to support university participation in community services on any significant scale,

and that it could not and should not be done by reallocation of the resources the universities already receive for support of instruction and research.

Unless and until these two views are reconciled, it would seem that efforts to engage urban universities and their communities in collaboration on community problem-solving and goal-pursuing are destined to be plagued by continuous misunderstandings and conflicting expectations. These Forums produced no very useful suggestions even as to how to go about reconciling these views, let alone achieving any reconciliation in their own discussions. It is at least conceivable, however, that what it referred to above as a progenitor council might be able, working more in depth and on a more sustained basis, to develop an understanding among its own members and through them develop more widespread understanding as to how university-community collaborative service programs are to be supported.

In conclusion therefore, this analysis of the Forums suggests that, at least for this particular community, the most promising next step would be to organize not more Forums of this sort but rather more of a working body, smaller in numbers of participants but broadly representative of the community and of the universities and colleges of the community, and to put this body to work on (1) developing mutual understanding of how university-community collaborative service efforts are to be supported financially and (2) designing a truly joint organization between the universities and the community in accordance with the guidelines suggested above. While the difficulties are many, the general spirit of the Forums suggests that there is reason to expect that this approach could be effective.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Coleman, Morton, James V. Cunningham, Marvin Feit, Norman Johnson, Philip Carter, and Joseph Colangelo. Is Conflict Utilization Underestimated? Background paper for University-Urban Interface Program, University Forum, October 21, 1971.

Gow, J. Steele. Goals and Government of the Metropolis. Background paper for University-Urban Interface Program, University Forum, February 24,1972.

Holden, Matthew Jr. Law and Order in the Metropolitan Area: Issues and Options. Background paper for University-Urban Interface Program, University Forum, November 18, 1971.

Nehnevajsa, Jiri. Pittsburgh Goals: Some Issues. University-Urban Interface Program, University Forum, October 21, 1971.

Nehnevajsa, Jiri. Pittsburgh Goals: Notes on the Criminal Justice System. University-Urban Interface Program, University Forum, November 18, 1971.

Nehnevajsa, Jiri. Pittsburgh Goals: Notes of Metropolitanism. University-Urban Interface Program, University Forum, February 24, 1972.

Nehnevajsa, Jiri, and Robert C. Brictson. Pittsburgh Goals: Some Thoughts on Health Issues. University-Urban Interface Program, University Forum, December 9, 1971.

Nehnevajsa, Jiri, and Alan N. Coleman. The Pittsburgh Goals Study, A Summary. University-Urban Interface Program, October, 1971.

Treuting, Waldo, W. T. Hall, and M. L. Baizerman. The University and The Community in the Domain of Health. University-Urban Interface Program, University Forum, December 9, 1971.